

Amendment under 37 C.F.R §1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/822,846

### **REMARKS**

Claims 7, 9 and 10 have been examined and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

#### **I. Preliminary Matters**

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the Abstract in a manner believed to overcome the objection. Applicant submits that the Abstract should not be used to narrow the scope of the claims.

#### **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims in a manner believed to overcome the rejection.

#### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,702,216 to Shima et al. (“Shima”)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Shima.

**A. Claim 7**

Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, the alleged spring supporting part 24 of Shima is not provided with a sloped surface facing towards a shutting direction side, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 7.

**B. Claims 9 and 10**

Since claims 9 and 10 are dependent upon claim 7, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of EP 0 924 702 to Morita et al.  
("Morita") (assigned to Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd.)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Morita.

**A. Claim 7**

Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable over the cited reference. In particular, the Morita figures cited by the Examiner, i.e., Figs. 16a-16b, 19, 24a-24d and 51a-51b, fail to teach or suggest the claimed spring supporting part. Further, Applicant submits that even by assuming *arguendo* that the wall portion 109 of cited Figure 19 discloses a *type* of spring supporting part, the wall portion 109 fails to have a sloped face that faces towards the shutting direction side of the slide door 3, as recited in claim 7.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R §1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/822,846

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable over the cited reference and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

**B. Claims 9 and 10**

Since claims 9 and 10 are dependent upon claim 7, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**IV. Newly Added Claims**

Applicant has added claims 11-14 to provide more varied protection of the present invention. Applicant submits that claims 11-14 are fully supported by Figures 8-10C.

**V. Conclusion**


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

Amendment under 37 C.F.R §1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/822,846

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 20, 2006